



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,716	04/04/2000	Allan Havemose	AM1990003	5108

32718 7590 06/10/2003

GATEWAY, INC.
14303 GATEWAY PLACE
ATTENTION: MARK S. WALKER (MAIL DROP SD-21)
POWAY, CA 92064

EXAMINER

OPIE, GEORGE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TD

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/542,716

Examiner

George L. Opie

Applicant(s)

Havemose

Art Unit

2151



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
 2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
 3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 14) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 15) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 16) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 17) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 19) ☒ Other: Text Docs for USP6,385,651 USP5,832,209

Art Unit: 2126

DETAILED ACTION

1. Request for copy of Applicant's response on floppy disk:
Please help expedite the prosecution of this application by including, along with your amendment response in paper form, an electronic file copy in WordPerfect, Microsoft Word, or in ASCII text format on a 3½ inch IBM format floppy disk. Please include all pending claims along with your responsive remarks. Only the paper copy will be entered -- your floppy disk file will be considered a duplicate copy. Signatures are not required on the disk copy. The floppy disk copy is not mandatory, however, it will help expedite the processing of your application. Your cooperation is appreciated.

2. Objection to the specification
On page 2 of the Application, the cross referenced applications are missing the PTO serial numbers for proper identification. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The U.S. Patents used in the art rejections below have been provided as text documents which correspond to the U.S. Patents. The relevant portions of the text documents are cited according to page and line numbers in the art rejections below. For the convenience of Applicant, the cited sections are highlighted in the *text documents*. Consistent with Office procedure, the U.S. Patents corresponding to the *text documents* are also included with this action.

4. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Krantz et al. (u.S. Patent 5,832,209).

As to claim 1, Krantz teaches user authentication "through centralized object authorization in a distributed computer network", p1 55-57 comprising

Art Unit: 2126

(a) "client passes the PAC information", p4 19-50 to the "object authorization service 240, which illustratively resides in computer 231", p5 31-54 and the PAC information is "presented" for access by "service object 130", p4 19-50

(b) "CAP object is created by server application ... and goes in ... OAS 240 ... associated with the server application", p6 7-15 and "client ... interact with CAP 135 in service object 130", p4 51-56

(c) "the client application contacts the server and"p6 37-52 initiates authentication, then "OAS 240 issues a continue or stop instruction ... and the server application will either perform or reject the client application request(s) accordingly."

As to claim 2, Krantz teaches the user authentication information is contained in a program object, p4 19-52.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dancs et al. (u.S. Patent 6,385,651).

As to claim 7, Dancs teaches a method for "providing managed access to network computer devices", p4 11-23 comprising

"network computer client device (NC) ... sends the relationship server a unique identifier ... the NC also transmits an enterprise identification number ... uniquely specifying the ISP to which the user wishes to connect", abstract

"relationship server 111 looks up the manufacturer identification number in the database 112 ", p5 39-57

"the relationship server determines whether the specified manufacturer has authorized connection to the specified ISP", p2 43 – p3 7 and

"NC client 101 ... authorized services.", p5 39-57

7. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Art Unit: 2126

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3-6 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Dancs (cited supra).

As to claims 3-5, Krantz (p4 19-50) teaches program objects used in the client-server interactive dynamic authentication processing.

As to claim 6, Dancs (p5 39-57) teaches providing client transmits its device info including, inter alia, the manufacturer identification number, the model number and the device serial number, , sans the user's identity.

As to claim 8, Dancs teaches information containing the services provided to the appliance, p5 39-57.

As to claims 9-12, see the discussion of claims 2-5 above.

As to claim 13, Dancs teaches a method for "providing managed access to network computer devices", p4 11-23

"network computer client device ... transmits an enterprise identification number ... uniquely specifying the ISP to which the user wishes to connect", abstract, and

the client "connects to a central relationship server" that makes the authentication determination and, if the client is authorized "the relationship server transmits NC connection information for the ISP ... ", p2 34 – p3 7.

Dancs does not explicitly disclose the additional limitations detailed below.

Krantz teaches user authentication "through centralized object authorization in a distributed computer network", p1 55-57

"the client application contacts the server and"p6 37-52 initiates authentication, then "OAS 240 issues a continue or stop instruction ... and the server application will either perform or reject the client application request(s) accordingly."

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Krantz with Dancs because Krantz's object authentication would provide Dancs with a central object-oriented security paradigm for effectively managing appliance interaction in the distributed computing environment.

As to claims 14-17, Krantz (p4 19-50) provides the object-oriented paradigm that would support Dancs's (pp8-15) billing mechanisms, thereby producing dynamic object interfaces for handling the requisite accounting transactions.

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 18, note the rejection of claim 6 above.

As to claim 19, Dancs (p14 46-55) teaches the ISP server handles account data including "credit card billing" systems.

As to claim 20, Krantz teaches "authentication through encryption to allow the distributed counterparts of objects to authenticate one another", p3 44-52.

9. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. Each reference disclosed below is relevant to one or more of the Applicant's claimed invention.

U.S. Patent No. 6,510,236 to Crane et al. which teaches the central authentication server;

U.S. Patent No. 6,385,729 to DiGiorgio et al. which teaches the object authorization for payment transactions;

U.S. Patent No. 6,219,790 to Lloyd et al. which teaches the centralized server for securing client authentication and accounting information;

U.S. Patent No. 5,727,145 to Nessett et al. which teaches the client-server authentication in a distributed object system.

10. Contact Information:

PTO Policy for Facsimile Submissions:

- ☐ AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7238.
- ☐ OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7239.
- ☐ NON OFFICIAL faxes should be sent to (703) 746-7240.

All OFFICIAL faxes will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. The date of entry will correspond to the actual FAX reception date unless that date is a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal Holiday within the District of Columbia, in which case the official date of receipt will be the next business day. The application file will be promptly forwarded to the Examiner unless the application file must be sent to another area of the Office, e.g., Finance Division for fee charging, etc.

- ☐ All responses sent by U.S. Mail should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
- ☐ Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park Two, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist). All hand-delivered

Art Unit: 2126

responses will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. Please do not hand deliver responses directly to the Examiner.

- ☐ Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at **(703) 305-9600**.
- ☐ Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Opie at (703) 308-9120 or via e-mail at *George.Opie@uspto.gov*. Internet e-mail should not be used where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the Applicant. Sensitive data includes confidential information related to patent applications.


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER